UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/683,537	10/09/2003	Todd Allen Berg	293/034 Div2	2610
1473 FISH & NEAV	7590 05/07/2007		EXAMINER	
FISH & NEAVE IP GROUP ROPES & GRAY LLP 1211 AVENUE OF THE AMERICAS			SNOW, BRUCE EDWARD	
	NY 10036-8704		ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER	
			3738	
				<u> </u>
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			05/07/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

			M			
	Application No.	Applicant(s)	7 V			
	10/683,537	BERG ET AL.				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	·			
	Bruce E. Snow	3738				
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	pears on the cover sheet with the	correspondence a	ddress			
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING D.  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period v.  - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATIO 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be to will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from a cause the application to become ABANDON	N. mely filed  n the mailing date of this of ED (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status						
,	action is non-final.	osecution as to th	a marite ie			
• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	nce this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is seed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.					
Disposition of Claims						
4) ☐ Claim(s) 108-119 is/are pending in the applica 4a) Of the above claim(s) 115-119 is/are withden 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) 108-114 is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	rawn from consideration.					
Application Papers						
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acc Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct	epted or b) objected to by the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. So tion is required if the drawing(s) is o	ee 37 CFR 1.85(a). bjected to. See 37 C				
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	Raminer. Note the attached Offic	e Action of lonn P	10-132.			
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119  12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of:  1. Certified copies of the priority document 2. Certified copies of the priority document 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority application from the International Burea * See the attached detailed Office action for a list	s have been received. s have been received in Applica rity documents have been receiv u (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	tion No ved in this Nationa	l Stage			
Attachment(s)  1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)  Paper No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summar Paper No(s)/Mail I 5) Notice of Informal 6) Other:	Date	·			

Art Unit: 3738

## **DETAILED ACTION**

Page 2

## Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 2/20/07 have been fully considered. Regarding the rejection as anticipated by view of Bolduc et al, applicant's arguments are persuasive.

Regarding the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Sideris are not persuasive. The referring to figure 3, the two sets of fingers 14 and 18 are extending radially outward from a longitudinal axis and are clearly spaced apart on opposites sides of the defect. Regarding the limitation "mounted on the portion", the Examiner again notes figure 3, wherein every element between the two sets of fingers 14 and 18 are the medial portion. It is the Examiner position that they are mounted "on" the medial portion.

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

- (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.
- (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.
- (e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

Application/Control Number: 10/683,537 Page 3

Art Unit: 3738

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) and the Intellectual Property and High Technology Technical Amendments Act of 2002 do not apply when the reference is a U.S. patent resulting directly or indirectly from an international application filed before November 29, 2000. Therefore, the prior art date of the reference is determined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

Claims 108-110, 112, and 114 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Sideris (5,433,727).

Sideris teaches:

108. (Currently Amended) A device for use in closing septal defects comprising:

first and second sets of fingers 18, 14 mounted on the medial portion that are capable of extending substantially radially outward from the axis, the first and second sets of fingers unconnected to each other at the radially outward ends and being spaced an axial distance apart from each other on the axis, and wherein only one set of fingers 18 is covered by a web of material 16 between adjacent ones of the fingers.

a medial portion (including elements 26) having a longitudinal axis; and

Regarding claim 114, see figure 3. Claim 114 is interpreted as positively claiming the device for closing septal defects.

Art Unit: 3738

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 111 and 113 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sideris teaches the device as described above, however, fails to specifically teach nitinol. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art have used nitinol for such a material for it's well known characteristics such as biocompatibility. Regarding silicone, Sideris teaches polyurethane; it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art have used silicone for such a material for it's well known characteristics such as biocompatibility.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Bruce E. Snow whose telephone number is (571) 272-4759. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Thurs.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Corrine McDermott can be reached on (571) 272-4754. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Application/Control Number: 10/683,537

Art Unit: 3738

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

bes

BRUCESNOW PRIMARY EXAMINED Page 5